



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,613	12/04/2003	Arvid M. Thomsen	687.02	1309
7590	03/18/2008			
DERGOSITS & NOAH LLP Attn: Andrew B. Schwaab Suite 1450 Four Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111				EXAMINER CHAPMAN, JEANETTE E
			ART UNIT 3633	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/18/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/729,613	THOMPSEN, ARVID M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeanette E. Chapman	3633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-12 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2,5,6 and 8-12 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

The purpose of this office supplemental response is to correct PTOL326, the office action summary and to correct the office action, specifically the rejection statement to include the Satori et al reference. See rejection below

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. “The securing of the planar object” lacks a proper antecedent in claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker 2806492) in view of Sutter (4593893) and Satori et al (5584217).

Becker discloses method of trimming a planar object plate 4 comprising:

- applying a decorating pattern, that includes an alignment line 15 to the planar object 4
- positioning the planar object 4 on a trimming table device, shown figures 5-7, wherein the trimming table device comprises a base 10, an alignment edge 6, an reader 7b/d and a movable saw 11;
- moving the planar object 4 over the table until an edge of the planar object 4 abuts the alignment edge 6;
- trimming the planar object with the movable saw 11 while the table is held stationary.

Becker moves the object using a different method in order for the reader to locate the alignment line. The recited method step is not seen as critical to the invention. Moving the table over the base until the optical reader locates the alignment line is an optional method of advancing the workpiece or planar object; one of ordinary skill in the art would have appreciated all of the known methods and would have selected any known method commensurate with the process;

Becker discloses securing the object 4 to the table prior to trimming the object by the feeding mechanism

Becker the table and the first saw 11 are movably coupled to the base 10 and the alignment edge.

Becker discloses the trimming of the planar object is performed by displacing a cutting saw relative to the planar object

Becker discloses moving the adjustment includes actuating a motor that is coupled to the adjustment table 10. It is obvious and inherent that in order to run the movable saw the same is performed and coupled to a motor in order to function. Additional saws function also by motors coupled thereto.

Becker discloses the trimming of the planar object includes displacing the saw along an edge of the planar object.

It would be obvious trim the second edge by moving the workpiece along the table or to add an additional saw to cut additional edges. Sutter discloses several saws and motors needed to perform more than one cutting operation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Becker to include as many saws and motors as needed perform additional cutting an trimming operation as shown by Sutter.

Becker lacks the optical reader as that shown by Sutter. It would have been obvious to employ the optical reader of Sutter in order to form a more accurate and precise cut to the work piece

Becker does not employ securing the planar object to the adjustment table with a plurality of suction discs. The securing method has been considered a matter of choice. One of ordinary skill in the art would have appreciated using any known method of

securing the work piece or planar object. The method of suction disc has not been considered critical to the method of the invention.

Becker lacks the adjustment table and this table secured to the trimming table. Sartori et al discloses a method of trimming an object. The adjustment table 20 is secured to the cutting table 21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Becker to include the adjustment table and to secure it to the cutting/trimming table in order to precisely and accurately position the work piece in relation to the saw and stand 20/21 of Becker as shown by Satori et al

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chapman E. Jeanette whose telephone number is 571-272-6841. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-thursday, 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, BRIAN GLESSNER can be reached on 571-272-6843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JEANETTE CHAPMAN/
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3633